



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

1848, the Liberty party met in convention at Buffalo, N. Y. (p. 232). Would it not be fair to recall to the reader that Douglas got his doctrine of popular sovereignty (p. 258) from Lewis Cass? The Ostend Manifesto (p. 261) was disavowed by Secretary Marcy. To say (p. 271) that the selection of Frémont by the first Republican convention was due "in no small degree to the fact that he had already been nominated by the seceding Know-Nothings" is to ignore factors of far greater importance. The joint resolution referred to (p. 309) was not passed by both Houses until February, 1865. The twenty-second joint rule of February 6, 1865, was in force for eleven, not "sixteen", years (H. R. *Journal*, 44 Cong., 1 sess., Appendix, p. 1542). It is inaccurate (p. 333) to say that "the legislation of the Forty-first Congress was accomplished with every State in the Union fully represented". Was Secretary Belknap "more sinned against than sinning" (p. 357)? "Nobody", says Mr. Rhodes (*History*, VII. 191), "had any doubt as to Belknap's guilt. His disgrace was complete." Joseph B. Foraker, not "Lucius Fairchild" (p. 432), was one of three nominees for the vice-presidency voted on by the Republican convention of 1884. Three references (pp. 450-451) to the act of succession of "1791" should read 1792. The succession law of 1886, drawn up by G. F. Hoar, was approved on January 19. "John" (p. 508) should read H. Clay Bascom. There are various inaccuracies in the statistics to be found on pages 285, 289, 325, 379, 409, 440, and 538. The Dingley tariff bill was approved (II. 7) on July 24, 1897. The word "eighteenth" (p. 9) should read nineteenth. "June 7" (p. 23) should read July 7. President Wilson (p. 304) took the oath of office in March, 1913, directly east of the dome of the Capitol, not "to the east front of the Senate wing". The first casting vote of July 18, 1789 (p. 311) was the result of a tie, 9 to 9. The whole section devoted to a consideration of the President's power of removal (pp. 307 ff.) could be more significantly based on such statistics as were compiled by Dr. C. R. Fish in 1899 (*Amer. Hist. Assoc., Report*, I. 67-86).

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

Francis Asbury: the Prophet of the Long Road. By EZRA SQUIER TIPPLE. (New York and Cincinnati: The Methodist Book Concern. 1916. Pp. 333.)

DURING 1916 the various Methodist bodies throughout the United States, celebrated the one-hundredth anniversary of the death of Francis Asbury, the first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. The most ambitious volume called forth by this celebration, is the one now under review, by President E. S. Tipple of Drew Theological Seminary, who has long been a student of the life and work of the pioneer bishop of Methodism. A number of lives of Asbury have previously been written; the first by Strickland in 1858; another by Rev. E. L. Janes in 1872; a third by Briggs in 1879, while in recent years two other brief

biographies have appeared. There have been three editions of Asbury's *Journal*. The first began to appear during Asbury's life, though it was not completed until 1821; the second edition was published in three volumes in 1854, while a last, abbreviated edition was issued some fifteen years ago, edited by President Tipple under the title, *The Heart of Asbury's Journal*. In preparing the present volume, President Tipple has drawn extensively upon his intimate knowledge of Asbury's *Journal*, and he has also made good use of unpublished manuscript sources in the library of Drew Theological Seminary, known as the "Emory Collection".

The author says, in his introductory chapter, "this book is not so much a biography as it is an estimate of the man", and as a matter of fact the book is a collection of more or less connected essays, which however succeed in giving a clear-cut, interesting picture of this bishop of the wilderness. Asbury is very evidently the author's hero, yet one finishes the book with a distinct feeling that the bishop deserves about all of the author's eulogies.

The chapters dealing with Asbury's relation to the American Revolution, and the one entitled the Long Road, are particularly interesting, especially to the student of history. When the American Revolution began, all the English Methodist missionaries returned to England, except Asbury, who states in his *Journal*, "I can by no means agree to leave such a field for gathering souls to Christ as we have here in America" (p. 126). But although he remained, Asbury refused to identify himself with the patriot cause, but rather kept aloof, and was suspected of being a Tory, as indeed were all the Methodists, during the whole of the Revolutionary period, this suspicion being largely due to Mr. Wesley's staunch support of the policies of Lord North and George III.

Immediately after the Revolution, Mr. Wesley made provision for the separation of the Methodist societies in America into a church, independent of the English societies, and Asbury was designated by him to be the general superintendent in America, though he refused to take that office until he had been elected by the preachers. From the time of Asbury's election, at the Christmas conference in 1784, until the day of his death, he was continuously on the road. "His home was on the road. . . . He had no other. When he came to America he rented no house, he hired no lodgings . . . but simply set out upon the long road, and was still travelling forty-five years later when Death finally caught up with him" (p. 159). He visited every nook and corner of the United States, not once but many times. "He went into New York state more than fifty times; New Jersey over sixty; Pennsylvania seventy-eight; Maryland eighty; North Carolina sixty-three; South Carolina forty-six; Virginia eighty-four; Tennessee and Georgia each twenty" (p. 162). He crossed the Alleghanies eighteen times, and everywhere he stopped in the homes of the people. In crossing the mountains in 1803 he speaks of seeing "men, women and children, almost naked, paddling

bare-foot and bare-legged along", making their way over the mountains, into the new states (p. 167). He travelled six thousand miles a year, and kept a journal.

Chapters IX. and X. give an admirable summary of the frontier type of Methodist preaching, while chapter XI. is an estimate of Asbury as a superintendent. Like his great spiritual father, Wesley, Asbury was primarily an organizer; "He had a face like flint against disorder and irregularity", and it was through his tact and strict adherence to regularity, and his skill as an ecclesiastic, that the Methodist Church was spared any serious schism during its early years.

W. W. SWEET.

Jeffersonian Democracy in New England. By WILLIAM A. ROBINSON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Political Science in Washington University. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1916. Pp. vi, 190.)

DR. ROBINSON has found a new subject, and handled it exceedingly well. The history of New England between 1790 and 1815 has, quite naturally, been written largely from a Federalist viewpoint. Federalism there was more than a party, bound up as it was with the dominant church, interests, personalities, and press, well rooted in the structure of New England society. Yet the section was never politically "solid". As soon as the personal factions of the eighties died down, Jeffersonian Democracy arose to dispute the supremacy of the "wise and good and rich". Dr. Robinson has carefully traced this development, keenly analyzed the party basis and structure, and given the party of Jefferson its due place in New England history. His principal materials were contemporary newspapers and pamphlets. He was hampered by lack of printed and manuscript party correspondence, the great abundance of which on the Federalist side so enlivens the annals of that party. The diaries of William Bentley and Nathaniel Ames partially fill this gap.

In 1792 New England was practically a unit behind Washington and Hamilton. The Republican party arose from within, through various groups separating from dominant Federalism partly on local issues, partly on foreign policy, and finding their natural place under the Jeffersonian standard. In New Hampshire, for instance, Republicanism began when the Langdon family connection was refused a bank charter. Even Connecticut, the most completely Federalized state in the Union, had to admit the thin end of a Jeffersonian wedge before 1800.

The most informing chapters in this monograph of consistent excellence are those on the Party Basis, and Religious Liberty. Outside the Maine district of Massachusetts, where the landlord-and-tenant relations between the settlers and leading Boston Federalists were the basis of opposition, the rise of Republicanism in New England cannot be ex-